REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment is proper because it does not raise any new issues requiring further search by the Examiner, narrows the issues on appeal, and is believed to place the present application in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 1-44 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

Claim 8 is amended merely to make a non-substantive editorial change (i.e., adding a colon and new paragraph after the word "comprising"), and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-44 stand rejected on prior art grounds.

Particularly, claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 23-26, 31-38, 40, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,491) in view of Robinson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,663). Claims 6, 14, 17-19, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,828). Claims 7, 15, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi, and further in view of Tsukahara (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,407). Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Robinson. Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Arai (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,758). Claims 39, 40, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Allen in view of Robinson and further in view of Nagamine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,070; hereinafter "Nagamine").

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. APPLICANT'S INVENTION

The claimed invention relates to a photo service system and a camera for use in such a system.

In an illustrative, non-limiting embodiment of the present invention, as defined by independent claim 1, a photo service system structured in an area includes a digital camera which transmits image data of images captured by the digital camera and identification information for identifying with the digital camera, a base station which receives the image data and the identification information transmitted from the digital camera, and a photo service center which prints the images according to the image data received by the base station and sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information received with the image data.

Other exemplary embodiments of the invention, as defined, for example, by independent claims 9 and 32, recite somewhat similar features as independent claim 1.

According to the claimed invention, images can be easily and efficiently printed and sorted merely by transmitting the image data from the camera after each image is captured. That is, the user simply captures an image, reviews the image on a display on the camera, and if a print of the image is desired, merely transmits the image.

Thus, the process of ordering prints is greatly simplified since the transmission of the image data directly results in an image being printed according to the image data received by the

base station and sorted according to the identification information of the camera that was used to capture the images (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 3-18).

Moreover, since the prints of the images are printed upon receipt of the image data and sorted according to the identification information for identifying with the digital camera that was used to capture the images, the printed images can be available for pick up by the user shortly after the image is captured (e.g., when the user returns the camera to the base station).

Also, since the system is capable of identifying the area from which the image data was transmitted, the claimed photo system is capable of identifying on each of the prints the respective area where the image was captured by the camera (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 18-21).

Moreover, in an exemplary embodiment of the photo system, each image captured by the camera replaces the previous image. Thus, the camera in the present invention does not require a storage medium, various shooting modes, or various operating switches. Instead, the digital camera of the photo system only needs to capture an individual image, display the image, and transmit the image. As such, the camera in the claimed system is easy to operate, small in size, lightweight, and less costly to produce (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 21-27).

Thus, the photo system of the claimed invention has clear advantages over conventional systems and is particularly suited for use in theme parks and amusement parks, where it would be advantageous to have an easily operated, lightweight, and inexpensive camera that may be used to reliably capture images without fear of losing or damaging the camera, which could result in the loss of the captured images (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 1-4). According to the claimed invention, the process of capturing and ordering prints is greatly simplified since the transmission of the image data directly results in an image being printed according to the

image data received by the base station and the printed images are then sorted according to the identification information *of the camera* that was used to capture the images (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 3-18). Thus, the user merely takes pictures using the camera and then returns to the camera to the base station to pick up the prints captured by that camera. The conventional systems do not teach or suggest these features.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 23-26, 31-38, 40, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Robinson. Claims 6, 14, 17-19, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi. Claims 7, 15, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi, and further in view of Tsukahara. Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Robinson. Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Arai. Claims 39, 40, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Robinson and further in view of Nagamine.

For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's positions, and therefore, traverses these rejections.

Applicant incorporates herein in their entirety the traversal arguments set forth in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 filed on August 31, 2004, for the Examiner's convenience.

A. In the "*Response to Arguments*" section of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "*Applicant's contend that the Allen reference prints the images according to the control*

signals or according o the image filed header; however, the Allen reference discloses beginning a printing operation according to (sic) the control signals or the image file header. The Allen reference prints the images received for the cameral on a printer when the print flag is set (see column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 1). It is inherent that a printer print according to (sic) the image data or image file or else the printer could not create the correct output of the image" (see Office Action at page 3, lines 5-10).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position for several reasons.

Independent claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites, a photo service system structured in an area, the photo service system comprising:

> a digital camera which transmits image data of images captured by the digital camera and identification information for identifying with the digital camera;
> a base station which receives the image data and the identification information transmitted from the digital camera; and
> a photo service center which prints the images according to the image data received by the base station and sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information received with the image data (emphasis added).

That is, the image data includes data of images, not identification information or print commands, such as a print flag.

As mentioned above, the Examiner alleges that "*Allen prints the images received for the cameral on a printer when the print flag is set (see column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 1). It is inherent that a printer print according to (sic) the image data or image file or else the printer could not create the correct output of the image*" (see Office Action at page 3, lines 5-10).

However, as the Examiner points out, Allen prints according to a print flag (i.e., command flags), not according to the image data received. Indeed, Allen specifically discloses that "*the image file header 72...includes the I.D. of the camera, command flags and the digital voice data*" (e.g., see Allen at column 4, lines 55-59; emphasis Applicant's), and not the image data. That is, the image file header 72, which includes the command flags, clearly is not the image data.

In Allen, the central processing unit 37 reads the image file header 72 and effects the action indicated by the command flags that are set. That is, the central processing unit 37 does not effect the printing action based on (i.e., according to) the image data, but instead, does so based on the command flags set in the image file header 72.

Applicant submits that Allen does not disclose or suggest printing the images according to the image data received by the base station, as claimed, but instead, specifically discloses printing the images according to the command flags that are transmitted in addition to the image data.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's position, the image fulfillment center 34 of Allen does not print the images "according to the image data", as claimed. Instead, Allen discloses printing the images according to the control signals or according to the image file header which include the command flags and which are transmitted in addition to the image date.

For example, Allen specifically discloses that:

> [t]he image fulfillment server includes a transceiver for receiving the digital image file and control signals; a memory for storing the received digital image file; and a file manager for managing the digital image file in response to the control signals (e.g., see Allen at column 1, lines 48-53; emphasis added).

As another example, Allen specifically discloses that:

> [a]t the fulfillment center, the transceiver 36 stores the digital images and the control signals and stores them temporarily in memory 38. The central processor 37 responds to the control signals to effect requested services related to the digital image (e.g., see column 4, lines 24-28; emphasis added).

Allen further discloses that:

> At the fulfillment center 34, the central processing unit 37 reads the image file header 72, which includes the I.D. of the camera, command flags and the digital voice data; and effects the action indicated by the command flags that are set (e.g., see column 4, lines 55-59; emphasis added).

Thus, Applicant submits that the image fulfillment center 34 of Allen does not print the images "according to the image data", as claimed, but instead, prints the images according to the control signals or according to the image file header which include the command flags and which are transmitted in addition to the image date.

Moreover, Applicant submits that claim 1 does not merely recite "a photo service center which prints the images according to the image data received by the base station".

That is, claim 1 recites a specific combination of features, which includes "*a photo service center which prints the images according to the image data received by the base station and sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information received with the image data*" (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully reiterates that, as argued in the Amendment filed on August 31, 2004, the grounds of rejection merely is identifying individual elements of the claims in separate references rather than considering the claimed invention as a whole for what it fairly teaches to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Indeed, the grounds of rejection is not even considering the above recitation as a whole, but instead, breaks the recitation of "a photo service center..." into two separate sub-elements and then merely attempts to identify those separate sub-elements in different references.

Applicant notes that the Examiner must consider the claimed invention as a whole for what it fairly teaches to one of ordinary skill in the art and cannot dispense with this requirement merely by attempting to identify the individual elements of the claims (or in this case, breaking the individual elements of the claim into separate sub-elements) in separate references.

Indeed, as the Federal Circuit clearly has held, it is not even enough to show that the individual elements can be found in different references or that it would be possible to combine those individual elements to arrive at the claimed invention. Instead, the Federal Circuit has held that the Examiner must establish that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious from the alleged combination of references.

In this case, Applicant respectfully submits that the grounds of rejection merely "picks and chooses" individual elements of the claimed invention from two separate references to try to arrive at the claimed invention.

For example, as set forth above, the claimed combination not only prints the images according to the image data received by the base station, but also sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information of the camera that captured the images, as recited, for example, in independent claim 1.

As mentioned above, Allen does not disclose or suggest printing the images according to the image data received, for which it is relied upon by the Examiner. Thus, even assuming *arguendo* that Robinson discloses the features for which it is relied upon, the resulting combination of Allen and Robinson still would not arrive at the claimed invention.

Nevertheless, neither Allen nor Robinson discloses or suggests the claimed combination of "a photo service center which prints the images according to the image data received by the base station *and* sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information received with the image data", as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, Allen and Robinson, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the claimed combination defined by independent claim 1.

Independent claim 9

As another example, independent claim 9 recites, *inter alia*:

> a photo service center which automatically prints the images according to the image data received by the at least one base station and sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information received with the image data (emphasis added).

Again, Applicant submits that nowhere does Allen disclose or suggest that the images are printed based on the receipt of the image data, but instead, requires that command flags be transmitted in addition to the image data to instruct the printer to print the image data.

In fact, the receipt of the commands flag does not necessarily result in printing unless a specific command flag (i.e., a print flag) is transmitted in addition to the image data. Indeed, if a "send to" flag is transmitted in addition to the image data, then the image data is transmitted 74 via a secondary transmission channel 46 (e.g., see Allen at column 4, lines 59-62), and therefore, is not printed.

Thus, Allen clearly does not disclose or suggest automatically printing the images according to the image data received, as claimed in independent claim 9.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the grounds of rejection fail to consider the invention as a whole.

That is, according to the claimed invention, the process of capturing and ordering prints is greatly simplified since the transmission of the image data directly results in an image being printed according to the image data received by the base station and the printed images are then sorted according to the identification information *of the camera* that was used to capture the images (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 3-18). Thus, the user merely takes pictures using the camera and then returns to the camera to the base station to pick up the prints captured by that camera. Accordingly, the photo system of the claimed invention has clear advantages over conventional systems and is particularly suited for use in theme parks and amusement parks, where it would be advantageous to have an easily operated, lightweight, and inexpensive camera that may be used to reliably capture images without fear of losing or damaging the camera, which could result in the loss of the captured images (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 1-4).

Applicant submits that Allen and Robinson, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the novel and unobvious combination of structural features of the claimed invention, or for that matter, even contemplate or mention the clear advantages provided by the claimed combination of structural features.

Thus, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the prior art rejections of claims 1-44.

B. In the "*Response to Arguments*" section of the Office Action, the Examiner further states that "*[t]he Robinson reference does not merely disclose sorting the prints in the same customer image order, when sorting the images in the customer order is referenced to in the specification it (sic) means sorting the images into the correct customer order from a plurality of customer orders (see column 7, lines 39-49). In order for the print sorter to sort by*

customer order, it is implied that the identification information received to (sic) the image data was used" (see Office Action at page 3, lines 11-15; emphasis Applicant's).

The Examiner also states that, "*[s]ince the Allen reference discloses all the limitation (sic) of claim 1, except for sorting the prints of the images according to the identification information received with the image data and the Robinson reference suggests this limitation, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine these references to sort multiple print orders so that the customer receives the correct batch of prints in a timely manner. Therefore, Allen in view of Robinson discloses all the claimed limitations of claims 1, 9, 32 and incorporations of these limitations into any dependent claims*" (see Office Action at page 3, lines 16-22).

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position, since claim 1 does not recite sorting the images by customer order or capturing a sequence within a customer order. Instead, independent claim 1 recites, a photo service system structured in an area, the photo service system comprising:

> a digital camera which transmits image data of images captured by the digital camera and identification information **for identifying with the digital camera**;
> a base station which receives the image data and the identification information transmitted from the digital camera; and
> a photo service center which prints the images according to the image data received by the base station and sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information received with the image data (emphasis added).

That is, in the claimed invention, the photo service center sorts the prints of the images according to the identification information, which is for identifying *with the digital camera*,

received with the image data. That is, the identification information used to sort the prints is the identification of the digital camera used to capture the images, not merely a customer order.

Again, Applicant respectfully reiterates that the ground of rejection of the present Office Action fails to consider the invention as a whole, and instead, attempts to identify the individual elements (and sub-elements) of the claim in separate references.

That is, according to the claimed invention, the process of capturing and ordering prints is greatly simplified since the transmission of the image data directly results in an image being printed according to the image data received by the base station and the printed images are then sorted according to the identification information *of the camera* that was used to capture the images (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 3-18). Thus, the user merely takes pictures using the camera and then returns to the camera to the base station to pick up the prints captured by that camera.

Accordingly, the photo system according to the claimed invention has clear advantages over conventional systems and is particularly suited for use in theme parks and amusement parks, where it would be advantageous to have an easily operated, lightweight, and inexpensive camera that may be used to reliably capture images without fear of losing or damaging the camera, which could result in the loss of the captured images (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 1-4).

Applicant submits that Allen and Robinson, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the novel and unobvious combination of structural features of the claimed invention, or for that matter, even contemplate or mention the clear advantages provided by the claimed combination of structural features.

Thus, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the prior art rejections of claims 1-44.

C. In the "*Response to Arguments*" section of the Office Action, the Examiner further states that, "*[t]he Allen reference discloses the base station selectively receives the image data when the camera performs the transmit command and sends the image data and identification information to a local base station over a wireless connection such as a cell phone. The term "local" discloses that the base station in proximity to the camera will receive this data based on the fact that it is in proximity. Therefore the Allen reference discloses the limitations of claim 31*" (see Office Action at page 4, lines 1-6; emphasis added).

For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

Claim 31

Claim 31 recites, *inter alia*, that "the at least one base station selectively receives the image data and the identification information based on a proximity of the at least one digital camera to the at least one base station" (emphasis added).

That is, the claimed invention specifically and positively recites that the base station selectively receives the image data and the identification information based on a proximity of the at least one digital camera to the at least one base station.

In comparison, Allen merely discloses that "*a sports photographer can transmit his digital images locally via wireless transmission to a local image fulfillment server at the stadium with instructions to make prints*" (e.g., see Allen at column 1, lines 60-64).

Applicant submits that, while a "local" fulfillment center or base station may be in a proximity of the camera, Allen clearly does not specifically and positively disclose or suggest, or

for that matter even contemplate or mention, selectively receiving the image data and the identification information *based on* a proximity of the digital camera to the base station.

That is, the claim does not merely recite that the base station is in the proximity of the camera, according to the Examiner's position. Instead, claim 31 specifically and positively recites that the base station selectively receives the image data and the identification information "*based on* a proximity of the at least one digital camera to the at least one base station".

Applicant submits that the Examiner must establish that each and every limitation of the claimed invention necessarily is present in the cited reference being relied upon.

In this case, clearly Allen and Robinson, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that data is received based on a proximity of the camera to the base station. In other words, merely sending the image data to a "local" fulfillment center does not necessarily disclose the affirmative recitation of selectively receiving the image data based on a proximity of the camera to the base station, as claimed.

Thus, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 31.

D. In the "*Response to Arguments*" section of the Office Action, the Examiner further states that, "*Allen discloses identifying each of the prints of the images based on a location corresponding to the (sic) base station that transmitted the file. The claim does not state the image is identified based (sic) on the location of each of the at least one base station, but rather a location corresponding. The Anderson reference discloses the further claimed limitations of claims 10, 31, and 33*" (see Office Action at page 4, lines 7-12; emphasis added).

However, is it unclear what the Examiner intended to mean by this statement.

Claims 10 and 33

That is, turning to the actual language of the claims, claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, that "*the photo service center identifies the prints of the images based on a location corresponding to the respective at least one base station that transmitted the image file*" (emphasis added).

Similarly, claim 33 recites, *inter alia*, "*identifying each of the prints of the images based on a location corresponding to each of the at least one base station that transmitted the image file*" (emphasis added).

The specification clearly discloses that, since the exemplary system is capable of identifying the location from which the image data was transmitted, the claimed photo system is capable of identifying on each of the prints the respective area where the image was captured by the camera (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 18-21).

For example, the particular attraction, from which the image was transmitted (i.e., the location corresponding to the base station that transmitted the image file), of a theme park can be identified on each print of the images which are transmitted from that particular attraction. On the other hand, prints of other images, which are transmitted from other attractions of the theme park, can be identified by the respective locations from which those images were transmitted (e.g., see specification at page 6, lines 12-20).

The Examiner erroneously appears to compare identifying where a print is to be sent, as allegedly disclosed by Allen, with the claimed feature of "*identifying each of the prints of the images based on a location corresponding to each of the at least one base station that transmitted the image file*", as defined by claim 33 (emphasis added), or with the claimed photo service center which "*identifies the prints of the images based on a location corresponding to the*

respective at least one base station that transmitted the image file", as defined by claim 10 (emphasis added).

Applicant submits, however, that merely disclosing *where* the prints are to be sent clearly does not disclose or suggest "identifying each of the prints of the images based on a location corresponding to each of the at least one base station that transmitted the image file", as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 10, 31, and 33 clearly are patentable over the alleged combination of references and the applied rejections.

Claim 40

As another example, Applicant respectfully notes that claim 40 recites, *inter alia*, that "*the location of said camera at the time of transmission is automatically printed on the prints of the images*" (emphasis added).

Clearly, identifying *where* the prints are to be sent (i.e., mailed or transmitted) clearly does not disclose or suggest that "*the location of said camera at the time of transmission is automatically printed on the prints of the images*", as recited in claim 40 (emphasis added).

Moreover, Nagamine clearly does not make up for the deficiencies of Allen and Robinson.

For example, the Examiner relies on column 6, lines 21-38 and column 7, lines 13-17 of Nagamine as allegedly disclosing that "*the base station comprises a plurality of base stations that selectively receive image data and identification information transmitted from the digital camera based on a location of said camera at a time of transmission of the image data of each image*" (see Office Action at pages 22-23, bridging paragraph; emphasis added).

The Examiner further alleges that "*[i]t would have been obvious to annotate the print of the Allen review (sic) in view of the Nagamine reference wherein the location of said camera at*

the time of transmission is automatically printed on the prints of the images in order to see where the picture was taken when viewing the prints" (see Office Action at page 23, lines 10-15; emphasis Applicant's).

However, the cited portions of Nagamine, which are relied upon by the Examiner, clearly do not recite these features, nor has the Examiner cited any other portions of Nagamine in support of such a conclusion.

As the Examiner surely knows, conclusory statements, which are unsupported by the cited references, are not sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, contrary to the Examiner's stated position, the cited portions of Nagamine merely disclose that image data, not the print of the image data, has position information (e.g., see Nagamine at column 6, lines 21-32 and column 7, lines 13-17).

Specifically, Nagamine discloses that "*the data of the position information is added to the image data stored in the image data storage 11 (ST78)*" (see Nagamine at column 6, lines 21-32; emphasis Applicant's).

Also, Nagamine discloses that "*[t]he image data transmitted at this time is image data having position information if the position information is added to the image data, or image data having no position information if no position information is added to the image data*" (see Nagamine at column 7, lines 13-17).

The cited portions of Nagamine clearly do not disclose, suggest, or even mention that "*the location of said camera at the time of transmission is automatically printed on the prints of the images*", as defined, for example, by claim 40 (emphasis added). Moreover, the Examiner has not cited any other portions of Nagamine in support of such a conclusion.

Thus, Nagamine clearly does not make up for the deficiencies of Allen and Robinson.

E. With respect to claim 42, the Examiner alleges that "*it is well known in the art (sic) to make the temporary memory in a camera only large enough to store one image while waiting to be further processed thereby minimizing the size it adds to the camera*" (see Office Action at page 14, lines 3-5).

However, Applicant submits that the trend in memory in digital cameras clearly is to provide larger amounts of memory that are capable of storing the image data for numerous (e.g., large numbers of) images, not to provide less memory to store only data for a single image, as the Examiner seems to suggest.

Applicant respectfully submits that such is not well known in the art, and therefore, requests that the Examiner cite a reference in support of this position so that Applicant can properly respond to the Examiner's position.

F. With respect to the remaining rejections over numerous combination of, for example, (a) Allen and Yamaguchi, (b) Allen, Yamaguchi, and Tsukahara, (c) Allen, Yamaguchi, and Robinson, (d) Allen and Arai), and (e) Allen, Robinson, and Nagamine, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable over the cited references by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1, 9, and 32, for the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

As mentioned above, Applicant incorporates herein by reference, in their entirety, all of the traversal arguments set forth in the Amendment filed on August 31, 2004, for the Examiner's convenience.

The Examiner respectfully is requested to reconsider such traversal arguments in view of the foregoing additional traversal arguments, and accordingly, to withdraw the rejections of these claims and permit all of the claims of the present application to pass to immediate allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the claimed invention (i.e., claims 1-44) would not have been obvious from the cited references, either alone or in combination, and even if combined, such a combination would not disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention.

Particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that, when considered as a whole for what it fairly teaches, the novel and unobvious combination of elements of the claimed invention clearly are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination.

Indeed, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a system or method in which images can be easily and efficiently printed and sorted merely by transmitting the image data from the camera after each image is captured, according to the claimed invention.

That is, according to the claimed invention, the process of ordering prints is greatly simplified since the transmission of the image data directly results in an image being printed according to the image data received by the base station and sorted according to the identification information of the camera that was used to capture the images (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 3-18). Moreover, since the prints of the images are printed upon receipt of the image data and sorted according to the identification information for identifying with the digital camera that was used to capture the images, the printed images can be available for pick up by the user shortly after the image is captured (e.g., when the user returns the camera to the base station). Also, since the system is capable of identifying the area from which the

image data was transmitted, the claimed photo system is capable of identifying on each of the prints the respective area (e.g., the particular attraction at an amusement park) where the image was captured by the camera (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 18-21).

Moreover, in an exemplary embodiment of the photo system, each image captured by the camera replaces the previous image. Thus, the camera in the present invention does not require a storage medium, various shooting modes, or various operating switches. Instead, the digital camera of the photo system only needs to capture an individual image, display the image, and transmit the image. As such, the camera in the claimed system is easy to operate, small in size, lightweight, and less costly to produce (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 21-27).

Thus, the photo system of the claimed invention has clear advantages over conventional systems and is particularly suited for use in theme parks and amusement parks, where it would be advantageous to have an easily operated, lightweight, and inexpensive camera that may be used to reliably capture images without fear of losing or damaging the camera, which could result in the loss of the captured images (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 1-4). According to the claimed invention, the process of capturing and ordering prints is greatly simplified since the transmission of the image data directly results in an image being printed according to the image data received by the base station and the printed images are then sorted according to the identification information *of the camera* that was used to capture the images (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 3-18). Thus, the user merely takes pictures using the camera and then returns to the camera to the base station to pick up the prints captured by that camera.

In comparison, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the claimed combination of features of claims 1-44 when considered as a whole for what they fairly teach to the ordinarily skilled artisan.

Therefore, the Examiner respectfully is requested to withdraw these rejections and permit claims 1-44 to pass to immediate allowance.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

The Examiner again is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of and accept the replacement sheet for Figure 8, which was filed on August 31, 2004.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-44, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: MARCH 11, 2005

John J. Dresch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254